

Facilitator's note: At the Sixth Meeting of the Sears Island Planning Initiative Steering Committee held on November 9th, 2006, the summary of the SC's previous meeting of October 16th 2006 was not accepted as presented. Rather than spend meeting time discussing the document, the SC agreed to list those suggested revisions on an addendum to the original Draft and include them as part of the record of SC proceedings. This document represents that addendum.

**Sears Island Planning Initiative
Steering Committee Meeting
Congregational Church, Searsport
October 16, 2006**

Proposed Revisions to Draft Summary of Fifth Meeting

1. The following revisions were proposed by Lorin Hollander in the document titled "FifthMtgSummary.Edited" and dated October 24th 2006. That document was sent to the SIPI Steering Committee on November 3rd 2006. Only those sections including Lorin's proposed revisions (in bold-face type) appear here:

IV. Presentation by DOT Commissioner David Cole re: Three Port Strategy, etc.

[Proposed revisions begin on the top of page 5 of Draft Meeting Summary:]

LORIN HOLLANDER CITED U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCE AGENCY statements made in the 1970's about massive environmental damage to Sears Island if THIS CARGO PORT PROPOSAL were TO BE permitted. Nutter stated that two permits were issued then taken back and the application was pulled before the Army Corps could rule on the application. The project that was proposed at that time to be permitted may not be the same as what might be proposed in the future.

More information on the Auburn Port was requested. One asked whether this type of port could be duplicated in other parts of the state, serving as an alternative to marine ports. It was further asked: If Wal-Mart meets its typical build-out target of 100 Super Centers in Maine, would the Lewiston Wal-Mart Distribution Center exhaust the capacity of the Auburn Port? Expansion of transportation capacity may not benefit our economy if the trend of bringing in cheap products from Asia continues.

Ben Crimauto, Scott Dickerson and other SC members asked whether DOT considers Sears Island part of the "Port of Searsport" as that term is used in the 3-Port Strategy? Brian Nutter responded that the "rule of thumb" for use of the term "port" includes both sides of the harbor, but today, the only cargo facility is at Mack Point. He said "The Port at Searsport" reference would encompass from

the town pier to the island. **THE PRESERVATION AND PORT GROUP DISAGREED WITH THESE STATEMENTS.** Nutter, Cole and Greg Nadeau said that currently the only existing cargo facilities is Mack Point.

John Melrose was asked about the use of the term Port of Searsport as used in “The Maine Vision for Marine Transportation” proposal for the island. He reiterated that the island was bought and the pier infrastructure created for marine transportation purposes. **THE PRESERVATION AND PORT GROUP STRONGLY DISPUTED THE CLAIM THAT THE ISLAND WAS PURCHASED FOR MARINE TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES.** The Marine Transportation Affinity Group views the causeway and the deep-water frontage as part of a potential facility, and therefore, part of the “Port of Searsport.” Sears Island is included in the “Port of Searsport” in that it implies that it can be developed as a port. **THIS WAS HOTLY DISPUTED, AND THE PORT AND PRESERVATION AFFINITY GROUP MAINTAINED THAT SEARS ISLAND IS EMPHATICALLY NOT PART OF THE PORT OF SEARSPORT, AND NEVER WAS. LEGISLATIVE DOCUMENTATION WAS REQUESTED OF THE DOT THAT SUPPORTED THEIR CONTENTION THAT SEARS ISLAND WAS PART OF THE PORT OF SEARSPORT.**

V. Discussion of Affinity Group visions

[Note: Proposed revisions begin at the bottom of page 6 of Draft Meeting Summary:]

Asked whether it views the whole of Sears Island as a transportation interest, the Marine Transportation Affinity Group said yes, DOT can only own property for transportation purposes. **THIS WAS CONTESTED AS THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD DOCUMENTS ANOTHER CONFLICTING SCENARIO REGARDING THE STEPS AND RATIONALE FOR THE ISLAND PURCHASE.** However, a valid transportation use would be the maintenance of a “buffer area” to any facility, and this area could remain undeveloped and used for recreation. “You might call it conservation, I might call it a buffer, but we’re talking about the same thing,” he said. At the Eastport facility, for example, one end of the buffer is used for recreation and the other for aquaculture. In response to questions, John Melrose asked whether after decades of effort to retain Sears Island for transportation use, should we now just set it aside? There must be a balance between the number of coastal acres for public access and the number of acres for working waterfront. What is wrong with the current situation which allows full public access to Sears Island? **PRESERVATION AND PORT GROUP POINTED OUT THAT THE CURRENT SITUATION LEAVES THE ISLAND AS VULNERABLE AS IT IS NOW TO MARINE TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT. THEY EMPHASIZED THAT THE 1990 CARGO PORT EFFORTS WERE DEEMED UNACCEPTABLY**

DAMAGING BY NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS, AND THE ENSUING 9 YEAR CIVIL ACTIONS AGAINST THE DOT IN THE 1990S UPHELD THAT EVALUATION.

Security concerns

- Who will pay for the security? In Harpswell, the town **WOULD HAVE HAD TO PAY \$8,000,000** for security at the LNG facility and the facility's revenue did not cover those costs. It was noted that Sprague pays for security at Mack Point.

Generating revenues/Costs

- What have been the real costs to taxpayers so far, including the legal and other costs associated with the 1997 Consent Decree? **MAINE TRANSPORTATION AFFINITY GROUP ASSERTS THAT TAXPAYERS "INVESTED" \$26,000,000 IN THE 1990'S CARGO PORT. LORIN HOLLANDER CITED STATE RECORDS WHICH DOCUMENT THAT ONLY \$17,000,000 IS ACCOUNTED FOR, THE REMAINDER COMING FROM FEDERAL FUNDS. HE POINTED OUT THERE IS STILL CONSIDERABLE QUESTION AS TO HOW THIS MONEY WAS SECURED AND STRUCTURED. THE MARINE TRANSPORTATION GROUP** noted that the figure of \$26 million emerged from a Freedom of Information Act request to the DOT. **DOCUMENTS SUPPORTING THE TRANSPORTATION GROUP CLAIMS WERE REQUESTED AND THE FACILITATORS PROMISED TO PROVIDE THESE.**

2. DOT's Fred Michaud provided the following corrections to the third paragraph of Section VIII:

VIII. Discussion of Work Plan between now and December (including Public Participation Meeting), Scheduling Meetings:

[Note: Proposed revisions begin at the top of page 11 of Draft Meeting Summary:]

.... The more comprehensive Port Development Plan will be completed in Spring 2007 and the Northeast CanAm Connections Study will not be completed in until Spring 2007—and 2008 with preliminary data available in December 2007. ~~respectively.~~ ...

3. An SC Member requested that reference be made in this Meeting Summary to discussions of the Open Space Meeting, as this has been a part of the ongoing deliberations. **?**